

Appl. No. 10/706,380
Amdt. dated 09/23/2005
Response to Office Action of 06/02/2005

Attorney Docket No.: TS01-1674
N1085-90185

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 were previously pending in this Application. Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 12-13, 16-17, 20-21, and 24 are hereby amended and claims 3, 7, 11, 15, 19 and 23 cancelled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of each of 5 pending claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22, and 24.

First and foremost, Applicants take this opportunity to thank Examiner Paul Dinh for taking the time to explain various aspects of the subject Office Action, in a telephone conversation with Applicants' undersigned representative, Mark J. Marcelli, that took place on September 13, 2005.

10 I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sano et al. (USPN 6,651,224), hereinafter "Sano". In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-24 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tang et al. (USPN 6,751,786), hereinafter "Tang".
15 Further, in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yonemori (USPN 6,609,241). Applicants respectfully submit that each of the rejections of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, should be withdrawn, for reasons set forth below.

The set of claims 1-24 includes independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21. Each 20 of these independent claims has been amended and as amended recites the feature of:

at least one delaying circuit within each of said functional circuits;
an *intra-functional* clock distribution network within each of the functional circuits;
25 an *inter-functional* clock distribution network between each of the functional circuits; and

Appl. No. 10/706,380
Amdt. dated 09/23/2005
Response to Office Action of 06/02/2005

Attorney Docket No.: TS01-1674
N1085-90185

5 inserting said delaying circuit at a terminal of said inter-function clock distribution network wherein each of said functional circuits is connected to said inter-functional clock distribution network and said delaying circuit includes a plurality of delaying buffer circuits that are serially connected by a plurality of interconnecting wiring segments, each delaying buffer circuit having a first increment of delay and said interconnecting wiring segments having a second increment of delay.

10 Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references recite the claimed combination of features of the claimed *intra-functional* clock distribution network, *inter-functional* clock distribution network, *delaying circuit disposed at a terminal* of the inter-functional clock distribution network and including a plurality of serially-connected delaying buffer circuits each of which have a first increment of delay and connected by
15 interconnecting wiring segments that have a second increment of delay. Applicants respectfully submit that therefore, independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21 are each distinguished from the reference of Sano, distinguished from the reference of Tang and distinguished from the reference of Yonemori none of which teach the above combination of features.

20 Applicants therefore respectfully submit that each of the rejections of
independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, should be withdrawn.
Claims 3, 7, 11, 15, 19 and 23 have been cancelled because their features have been
added to independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21, respectively. Claims 2 and 4
depend from independent claim 1; claims 6 and 8 depend from independent claim 5;
25 claims 10 and 12 depend from independent claim 9; claims 14 and 16 depend from
independent claim 13; claims 18 and 20 depend from independent claim 17; and claims
22 and 24 depend from independent claim 21. Claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20 and 24 have
been amended for consistency with the amendments made to their respective base
claims. Each of the dependent claims is similarly distinguished from the references
30 because of their respective dependencies from the independent claims, distinguished
as above. The rejection of claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22 and 24 under 35

Appl. No. 10/706,380
Amdt. dated 09/23/2005
Response to Office Action of 06/02/2005

Attorney Docket No.: TS01-1674
N1085-90185

U.S.C. § 102, should therefore also be withdrawn. Each of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22 and 24 is in allowable form.

Appl. No. 10/706,380
Amtd. dated 09/23/2005
Response to Office Action of 06/02/2005

Attorney Docket No.: TS01-1674
N1085-90185

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, each of pending claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22 and 24 is in allowable form and the application in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully and expeditiously requested.

5 The Assistant Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any excess payment that may be associated with this communication to deposit account 04-1679.

Respectfully submitted,

10

Dated: SEPTEMBER 23, 2005



Mark J. Marcelli, Reg. No. 36,593
Attorney for Applicant

15

DUANE MORRIS LLP
20 101 West Broadway, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 744-2200
Facsimile: (619) 744-2201